

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated June 7, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 4 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,251,888 to *Leflar* (hereinafter "*Leflar*") or U.S. Patent No. 4,893,703 to *Kennedy et al.* (hereinafter "*Kennedy*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Initially, the Office Action indicated that claim 1 is construed under the *Jepson* format such that the subject matter preceding the transitional phrase "comprising" is treated as admitted prior art. According to 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(e) and M.P.E.P. 2129, when a claim is an improvement and drafted in *Jepson* format, a transitional phrase, such as "wherein the improvement comprises" should be included in the claim. The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not an improvement. Furthermore, claim 1 is not in *Jepson* format and does not include a transitional phrase indicative of an improvement. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's interpretation of claim 1 as a *Jepson* claim is improper.

Turning to the merits of the Office Action, as required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that *Leflar* does not teach every element recited in claim 1. Thus, *Leflar* cannot anticipate claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a motor shaft structure for a clothes dryer, comprising, among other features, "a drying drum rotatably mounted in a body, a motor bracket fixed to a bottom of an inside of the body, a motor mounted on the motor bracket for generating a rotating power, the motor having a motor shaft and a fan coupled to the motor shaft." *Leflar* does not disclose these

features and claim 1 is therefore allowable over the reference. Likewise, claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Similarly, *Kennedy* does not teach the previously discussed features recited in claim 1 and therefore cannot anticipate claims 1-3. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 4 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,203,093 to *Baker* (hereinafter “*Baker*”) in view of either *Leflar* or *Kennedy*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with regard to claims 4 and 6-9.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicant respectfully submits that neither of the cited references, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest all the elements recited in claims 4 and 6-9. In particular, claim 4 has been amended to recite a laundry dryer comprising, among other features, a motor shaft which “includes a chamfer configured to cooperate with a tool to prevent the motor shaft from rotating when the fan is removed from the motor shaft.” As correctly pointed out in the Office Action, *Baker* does not disclose a motor shaft having chamfered parts. *See e.g.*, the Office Action at page 4. The Applicant submits that *Leflar* also does not disclose this feature. Nevertheless, the Office Action alleges that *Leflar* does teach a chamfer in a motor shaft at the left column of page 2, lines 53-59. *See e.g.*, the Office Action at page 4. The Applicant disagrees. At most, *Leflar* discloses a chamfer which facilitates the insertion of a shaft. However, the chamfer is not “configured to cooperate with a tool to prevent the motor shaft from rotating when the fan is removed from the motor shaft.” In addition, *Kennedy* fails to disclose a motor shaft having a chamfer configured to cooperate with a tool to prevent the motor shaft from rotating when the fan is removed from the motor shaft. At most, *Kennedy* discloses a chamfer

for transmitting a torque to a valve plate 54. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable over the cited references and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 6-8, which depend from claim 4, are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite a laundry dryer comprising, among other features, a motor shaft which “includes a chamfer configured to facilitate removal of the fan from the motor shaft.” As previously discussed, none of the cited references, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest, these features. Accordingly, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claims 1-4 and 6-9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,874,248 to *Hong et al.* (hereinafter “*Hong*”) in view of either *LeFlar* or *Kennedy*. The Applicant traverses the rejection. The Applicant respectfully submits that neither of the references, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest all the features recited in claims 1-4 and 6-9. As correctly pointed out in the Office Action, *Hong* does not disclose a chamfered portion. *See e.g.*, the Office Action at page 5. Furthermore, as previously discussed, neither *LeFlar* nor *Kennedy*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest this feature. Therefore, claims 1-4 and 6-9 are patentable over the cited references and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No. 42,766

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicants